

Notification allows for early medical treatment which can prolong and improve lives. It also curtails the spread of HIV, and therefore, saves lives.

Studies confirm that only 10 percent or less of people who have recently tested HIV-positive manage, by themselves, to notify their partners.

Between 50 percent and 90 percent of those who tested positive cooperate voluntarily with notification. Further, even higher proportions of those partners contacted—usually 90 percent or more—voluntarily obtain an HIV test.

An overwhelming number of Americans believe that the rights of partners of those infected with HIV should be balanced against medical privacy rights held by the infected partners according to a poll published in the New York Post.

Legislation requiring spousal notification has already been signed into law (Public Law 104-146). It makes perfect sense to expand notification to all of those who may have been exposed to HIV.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has concluded that even if only one in 80 notifications results in preventing a new case of HIV-infection, given the huge medical and social costs of every case, notification pays for itself.

The American Medical Association (AMA) has endorsed non-consensual partner notification for HIV infection and CDC has required states to establish procedures for partner notification for AIDS.

More than 30 states have enacted specific HIV partner notification provisions as of July 1994 and several others have passed laws allowing for the disclosure of HIV information in response to a court order.

It is estimated that between 630,000 to 900,000 Americans are living with HIV infection and about 50,000 people became infected with HIV each year. Sadly, most of those infected do not know it and do not get tested until they are already sick with AIDS-related disease. By this point, they have been denied the medical care that can prolong their lives and stave off illness and may have infected others unknowingly.

Aggressive partner notification will also bring greater safety to our nation's blood supply.

HIV TESTING FOR SEXUAL OFFENSES

The HIV Prevention Act requires that those accused of sexual offenses be tested for HIV.

Many times the victims of rape and other sexual assaults also become victims of HIV.

Because HIV is incurable, rape and molestation victims must have the right to know if they have been exposed to HIV as soon after exposure as possible so they can immediately begin medical treatment if necessary.

Victims can not rely solely on testing themselves for the disease because there is often a lag time that can last for several months between HIV exposure and infection. Therefore, the only timely, logical and practical way for a victim to know if they may be at risk of HIV is to learn the status of their attacker.

Most states allow for victims to find out whether their attackers have HIV, but only after convicted of an assault, which may take many months or even years.

Even if the victim tests negative, knowing the status of their assailant provides many victims with a sense of relief and allows them to seek further medical advice and take precautions if positive.

HIV AND MEDICAL PROCEDURES

The HIV Prevention Act protects both health care patients and professionals from inadvertent exposure to HIV. It would do

this by encouraging medical associations to establish guidelines for providers with HIV to follow in the performance of any risk prone invasive medical procedure on a patient and by allowing providers to test a patient for HIV before performing such a procedure if the provider considers such a test necessary.

Both health care professionals and patients should be given the ability to protect themselves from unwarranted HIV exposure.

A recent study of hospital nurses concluded that workplace stress due to the fear of HIV contagion is high and the most effective way to reduce fear is to inform staff of the HIV status of patients.

Similar proposals regarding patients and health care providers passed the Senate overwhelming in 1991, but were later dropped in conference.

The public would like doctors and dentists with AIDS or HIV to be legally required to inform their patients of their health status according to 93% of those polled in a New York Post survey.

IRRESPONSIBLE BEHAVIORS INVOLVING HIV

The HIV Prevention Act expresses the sense of the Congress that States should criminalize irresponsible behaviors by those who are infected.

Those who are infected with any disease have a responsibility to prevent transmitting the disease to others. Because no cure exists for HIV, those who knowingly place others at risk of infection are endangering innocent lives.

79% of Americans believe that those who knowingly infect another person with HIV should face criminal charges. Half of those surveyed said that people who knowingly transmit the virus should be charged with murder.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND HIV

The HIV Prevention Act expresses the sense of Congress that strict confidentiality must be observed at all times in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Act, lowers tough U.S. standards, governing the use of the "dolphin safe" label on tuna sold in our country, to accommodate foreign fishermen and foreign governments.

In its present form, this bill should be opposed. Not only will it lead to the killing of more dolphins, but it will also break a promise that the House of Representatives made to the American public 4 years ago concerning the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade agreements with which we comply.

At that time, I brought to the floor a resolution which promised the American public that the United States would not weaken any of its domestic environmental laws, laws protecting

public health and safety, or consumer protection laws in order to meet our international trade obligations. That resolution passed the House unanimously.

The bill we are considering breaks that promise we made to the American people. This legislation weakens standards that have been in effect for 6 years governing use of the "dolphin safe" label on tuna sold in the United States.

Current U.S. standards prohibit the chasing, harassing, or injuring of dolphin, in order for tuna to be labeled "dolphin safe." These prohibitions have been in the Marine Mammal Protection Act since 1972.

However, H.R. 2823 says the "dolphin safe" label could be used as long as no dolphins are killed during the setting of a tuna net. As a result, this bill would let tuna be labeled as "dolphin safe", even though the fishermen who catch it may be in violation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Why are we making these changes in longstanding U.S. policy? It is simply because Mexico and other South American governments are pushing for it.

Our first priority should be our promises to American consumers, not the concerns of foreign governments and foreign fishermen.

Proponents of this legislation say we need to change our standards to bring the United States into compliance with our trade obligations. That simply is not true.

This bill goes far beyond what is needed to comply with trade agreements to which we are a party. Mexico and other governments are simply using our trade agreements as an excuse to force other changes in U.S. law that are not justified and should not be made.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be offered later by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] which reiterates current U.S. policy on the use of the "dolphin safe" label. The amendment would not change, however, those provisions of the bill designed to bring the U.S. into compliance with trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the bill should be defeated.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hope Baptist Church of Newark, NJ. On Sunday, September 15, 1996, they will celebrate the 93rd Founder's Day and Mortgage Burning Service. I ask my colleagues to join with me in praising their diligence and applaud them on a job well done. Their level of community service is phenomenal and the 10th District of New Jersey is fortunate to have this church as one of our own.

New Hope Baptist Church was organized in 1903 by two sisters, Addie and Maggie Divine. Their first pastor was Reverend Jesse Williams. The current pastor, Rev. Charles Everett Thomas, began his tenure position at New

Hope Baptist Church in 1968 and 10 years later he began a fundraising project to expand the church. They have shown that this is a church with the open door that administers to the needs of the whole man.

The members and supporters of the church have worked diligently for several years to realize their dream. Expansions and overall growth culminated in their final move, on September 13, 1987 into their new edifice.

This church has reached out to the community with a day care center, an apartment complex, a food and clothing ministry, and a minority trade training program. Their support of the community has been stellar and this is part of what makes their success and growth so exciting. As we witness the growing number of churches being burned around this Nation and communities being engulfed by fear it is encouraging to see a mortgage burning instead of a church burning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating New Hope Baptist Church on their 93rd Founder's Day and Mortgage Burning Ceremony. May God continue to bless the members of New Hope Baptist Church.

TRIBUTE FOR FINNFEST USA 1996

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of the House and the entire Nation of the 14th annual FinnFest USA festival, which will be held in Marquette, MI, on August 7–11, 1996.

FinnFest USA is a national festival, open to everyone, celebrating the culture of Finland and Finnish Americans. It is held annually, hosted each year at a different site, and this year it is being held in Michigan's Upper Peninsula at Marquette.

FinnFest USA traces its beginnings back to September 12, 1982, when Tauri Aaltio, executive director of Finland Society, Helsinki, Finland, hosted a meeting in Minneapolis, MN. At the meeting, 39 representatives from Finnish American organizations from throughout the United States met to discuss the new organization. One of the goals of the organization is to work with new immigrants in the United States and to keep their cultural ties. So Finnish families and those who wish they were Finnish come together to celebrate their ethnic heritage. At this first meeting the Finland Society voted to call their annual festival "FinnFest USA".

The first FinnFest was held the following year on August 7, 1983. The 39 original representatives voted and approved that this annual festival was to be held each year in a different location in the United States. Its bylaws and articles of incorporation were read and approved. The election of the first board of directors was held, and it was decided that there would be nine board members. Three members from each the Western, Midwest, and Eastern parts of the United States.

FinnFest USA provides Finnish Americans an opportunity to meet one another and to broaden and deepen their knowledge of Finland and Finnish American history and culture. This year's event will include music, folk dancing, dances, educational forums, arts and

crafts, exhibits, banquet, and other food events, singing and much more.

The FinnFest USA '96 theme is "Finn Family Reunion: Passing the Torch of Heritage," indicating the festival will be a big family reunion. In recognition of the large number of Finnish Americans who reside in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, FinnFest USA '96 will be making its third appearance in 14 years in the Upper Peninsula. Carl Pellonpaa is president of FinnFest USA '96. Carl is the host of Suomi Kutsuu (Finland Calling), the only weekly Finnish language television program in the United States.

The unique bond between the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and Finland was evident by the recent visit to my Washington, DC, office of the Speaker of the Finnish Parliament, Ms. Riita Uosakainen. I found Speaker Uosakainen to be an outgoing, thoughtful person who truly represents her country, her people and all Finnish Americans in a warm, graceful manner.

I look forward to joining Ms. Uosakainen, Mr. Pellonpaa, all the "true Finns" and the "fake Finns" at the opening of FinnFest USA '96 in Marquette on August 7, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, FinnFest USA and Finnish Americans enjoy a proud history. On behalf of the State of Michigan, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and the entire Nation, I would like to declare FinnFest USA Observance Week, August 5–11, 1996, and congratulate FinnFest USA on an excellent festival which is recognized as part of our Nation's and our Finnish heritage.

PRAIRIE GRASS RISING

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, President Thomas Jefferson lamented the tendency, even in his day, of politicians to "generalize and concentrate all cares into one body." Throughout our history, from his day to ours, there has been a constant battle between those who would centralize power in Washington and those who struggled to keep it dispersed among the people and in their local communities.

I was proud to have worked for several years for a great man who was in his time one of the Nation's most eloquent voices for the Jeffersonian decentralist tradition, Ronald Reagan. During those years some of his most memorable remarks on this theme were penned by my friend John McClaughry, who served as one of Governor Reagan's speechwriters and idea people.

When Governor Reagan was elected President, John McClaughry sold his cow to pay for the moving expenses from his log cabin on Kirby Mountain, VT to Washington, where he served as White House Senior Policy Advisor in the first 2 years of the Reagan Presidency. I suppose very few White House Senior Policy Advisors in this century, at least, can make such a statement.

John, who has many friends among this body, went home to Vermont in 1982. He was subsequently elected twice by large majorities to the Vermont State Senate, and is now president of the Ethan Allen Institute, a Jeffersonian think tank in Concord, VT.

On June 28 he delivered the keynote address to the National Conference on Decentralism sponsored by the E.F. Schumacher Society at Williams College. I include at this point an excerpt of his remarks on that occasion, which I hope Members and others will find interesting and useful.

PRAIRIE GRASS RISING

(By John McClaughry)

When this country was first settled by Europeans in the 17th and 18th centuries, there was little expectation that we would fall prey to indigenous centralized power. That was what most immigrants gladly left behind them in the Old World. The new settlements were small and widely dispersed, on the rim of a great, fruitful and thinly populated continent. There was none of the industrialization that later did so much to promote giant institutions. Indeed, as late as 1783, Mr. Jefferson could write in advocacy of an agrarian America, "let our workshops remain in Europe".

Another important fact was that Americans were never subject to feudalism. Feudalism calls to mind castles and crusades, jousting and feasting. Ivanhoe and Prince Hal. Shorn of those romantic garments, however, feudalism was a deadly serious business. At its heart was feudal land tenure.

Land could not be owned by anyone save the crowned knave called the sovereign. It could only be held, and the holding carried with it all sorts of duties. The most important was to lead armed men to the aid of the superior in the feudal hierarchy when he got into a bloody altercation with another such ruffian, spotted some easy and unprotected pickings elsewhere, or went off to Jerusalem to free the Holy City from the infidels and get in good with the Pope.

Admittedly, feudalism was a strong force for social stability and military security in a tempestuous age. Unfortunately, feudalism stifled liberty, opportunity, and self government. By the time the colonies were settled, it was rapidly dying out in England.

Thus it never took root on these shores, with the minor—at least to us—exception of the great feudal estates just to the west of where we meet today, in the Hudson valley.

Yet another barrier to the rise of centralized power in America was the ideology of what was called in England the Country Party. That system of political beliefs was found in abundance throughout the writings of the great republican and whig leaders of our revolutionary period.

The Country Party was bitterly opposed to the beliefs and practices of its nemesis, the Court Party. It detested a monopoly on religion by the established church. It had an absolute horror of the standing national army and conscription. It despised government run banks and the issuance of paper money, which could be manipulated by rich elites to defraud the honest farmer, artisan and mechanic.

It hated corporate monopolies conferred by corrupt governments, taxation without representation, and the gang of fawning hangers-on who subsisted as parasites at the Court. It demanded that the people of a community be given the power to appoint their own judges and justices of the peace, and the members of the militia be given the power to elect their own officers. It resisted with vigor every effort of the Crown to restrict the historic liberties of the common people.

As Lance Banning has so ably shown in his brilliant book *The Jeffersonian Persuasion*, this Country Party ideology became the ruling beliefs of the early Jeffersonians. And when Mr. Jefferson came to the Presidency in the Revolution of 1800, he acted on those beliefs.